UNITY

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

Behind the Scenes at Geneva

By Sydney Strong

The Oxford Group Today - - - - - *Samuel M. Shoemaker*

Costs of College - *Joseph Ernest McAfee*

Commercializing the Churches *Jerome Davis*

Thomas Paine - - - *Curtis W. Reese*

Trumpets on New Horizons

VOLUME CXII NUMBER 12

Chicago, February 5, 1934

PRICE TEN CENTS

UNITY

Established 1878

(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor, 1880-1918)

Published Bi-Weekly *Subscription $3.00*

Until Further Notice *Single Copies 10 cents*

UNITY PUBLISHING CO., Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago, Ill.

"Entered as Second-Class Matter November 15, 1933, at the Post Office at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879."

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES, *Editor* CURTIS W. REESE, *Managing Editor*

Board of Directors

MRS. S. O. LEVINSON, President
MRS. E. L. LOBDELL, Vice-President
MRS. IRWIN S. ROSENFELS, Treasurer
MRS. FRANCIS NEILSON
MRS. ELLA R. NAGELY
MRS. O. T. KNIGHT
MR. IRWIN S. ROSENFELS
MR. C. W. REESE
MISS MATILDA C. SCHAFF
MRS. E. E. SMITH
MR. FRANCIS NEILSON
Secretary: MAY JOHNSON

ROBERT C. SCHALLER
CLARENCE R. SKINNER
SYDNEY STRONG
JABEZ T. SUNDERLAND
ARTHUR L. WEATHERLY
JAMES H. WEST

Poetry Editors

LUCIA TRENT
RALPH CHEYNEY

Editorial Contributors

W. WALDEMAR W. ARGOW
DOROTHY WALTON BINDER
RAYMOND B. BRAGG
EDMUND B. CHAFFEE
PERCY M. DAWSON
ALBERT C. DIEFFENBACH
JAMES A. FAIRLEY
ZONA GALE
A. EUSTACE HAYDON
JESSE H. HOLMES
LOUIS L. MANN
JOSEPH ERNEST MCAFEE
H. R. MUSSEY
M. C. OTTO
ALSON H. ROBINSON

Foreign Representatives

AUSTRALIA—CHARLES STRONG
AUSTRIA—STEFAN ZWEIG
BULGARIA—P. M. MATTHÉEFF
ENGLAND—HARRISON BROWN
FRED HANKINSON
REGINALD REYNOLDS
FRANCE—G. DEMARTIAL
ROMAIN ROLLAND
GERMANY—THEODOR HAHN
INDIA—RABINDRANATH TAGORE
JAPAN—NOBUICHIRO IMAOKA
PALESTINE—HANS KOHN
RUSSIA—ALINA HUEBSCH

Contents

EDITORIAL—
Notes 191
Behind the Scenes at Geneva—SYDNEY STRONG 193
Jottings—J. H. H. 196

ARTICLES—
The Oxford Group Today—SAMUEL M. SHOEMAKER 196
Costs of College—JOSEPH ERNEST MCAFEE 198
Commercializing the Churches—JEROME DAVIS 202
Thomas Paine—CURTIS W. REESE 204

POETRY—
Hymn—ROBERT C. SCHALLER 191
Trumpets on New Horizons:
Bewildered Years—CLIFFORD GISSLER 203
The Black—MARGARET DUNNING FLICK 203
Christ at a Church Supper—ROLAND COOKE 204
Nazi—FANIA KRUGER 204
Cry for Peace—MADELINE MULVEY 204

THE STUDY TABLE—
Two Books on Gandhi—JOHN HAYNES HOLMES 205
The Church and the Social Question—JAMES A. FAIRLEY 205

CORRESPONDENCE—
Religion and Science—R. J. WESTLAKE 206

THE FIELD—
Youth Against War—REGINALD A. REYNOLDS 190

The Field

"The world is my country, to do good is my Religion."

Youth Against War

Impressions of the Youth Congress at Paris, September 22-24

(From Our Special Correspondent)

The nearest approach to objectivity is a practical recognition of our personal bias.

My own bias is individualist and contra-suggestive. I dislike my fellow-men when I meet them in herds, and feel an insatiable desire to do the opposite to whatever they happen to be doing. This does not make me an opponent of mass activity; on the contrary, it makes me suspicious of my ability to be fair to it. Even as I sensed the revolt within myself against the tireless enthusiasm of Marxist youth for repetitive rhetoric, poured forth in three days of slogans and dialectics, I had to admit that this crude medicine was working. . . .

It is over a year since the Rolland-Barbusse Conference was called at Amsterdam. In its essentials it was very similar to the Youth Congress at Paris, which I have just attended. It was, I suppose, a fair sample of what International Conferences always will be, so long as political enthusiasts combine a love of talking with an heroic capacity for listening, and test their physical stamina by repeating to one another in different tongues and with appropriate gesticulation the articles of a common faith. You may marvel at the length of the speeches, with their innumerable repetitions of truisms, already repeated times beyond number by previous speakers. You may be astonished at the hours of unceasing energy devoured in this process; at its incredible continuation for three whole days. But it is the Revolution, nevertheless, that is brewing in this seething cauldron, and without the slightest doubt, *ça ira* . . .

* * *

I could wish, if the *Internationale* must really be sung thirty times a day at these Conferences, that Comrades would start it in a more reasonable key. Long before I have decided whether to strike out for the impossible altitude at which it begins its periodic flights, or to plunge down an octave . . . it is over, and we are sitting down again.

(Continued on page 207)

UNITY

"He Hath Made of One All Nations of Men"

Volume CXII MONDAY, FEBRUARY 5, 1934 Number 12

HYMN

(For Franklin D. Roosevelt)

I am the Sword, the everlasting Flame.
Across an unimaginable night
I lit your way; at Armageddon's height
I led you through catastrophe to fame.
Around me lie the bodies of my friends;
But we have triumphed; torches are alight
To blaze our triumph over lawless might;
But round me lie the bodies of my friends.

Amidst triumphal anthems sounds the knell,
But time for joy or sorrow there is none.
The trumpets sound the onset and proclaim
The Virgin of the Field; her standards swell—
O follow me to victories unwon!—
I am the Sword, the everlasting Flame.

ROBERT C. SCHALLER.

It is only by bearing in mind this final uprising of hopeless men against the existing order of western civilization that we can comprehend the paradoxes of Naziland. For it is a land of paradoxes, startling, bizarre. On every hand they strike the visitor between the eyes. The Nazi movement is grounded in idealism. "We are subordinating private gain to national service," a professor at the University of Berlin tells me. Yet idealism's weapon is ruthless brutality and terrorism.

Adolf Hitler, its leader, appeals for the cooperation of all men "of good will." Yet the movement excludes large masses of the population from the new state it is building. The Hitler government is a pure dictatorship. Yet it has overwhelming popular support, such as has come to no other dictatorship. It has no opposition worthy of the name. Yet it persecutes with a ferocity that would seem explicable only if it were fighting for its life against a counter-revolution.

So writes Henry D. Haskell, editor of the Kansas City *Star,* in a statement from Berlin. The phrase which strikes us with alarm, almost terror, is in the opening sentence—*"this final uprising of hopeless men against the existing order of western civilization."* Elsewhere, in his article Mr. Haskell speaks of the "current that has boiled up from the depths of a mass mind seething under the blind emotions of two distressful decades." In studying Hitlerism, this source of its appalling rise must never be forgotten. The Nazi movement has its social causes, as cancer has its physical causes, and they are the demoralization of the War, the humiliation of the great defeat, the betrayal of the Versailles Peace, the vast ruin and agony of the inflation, the long economic struggle against insuperable odds, and the final despair of "hopeless men." Revolution comes, a German told us in Berlin in 1921, "when a majority of the population no longer has any stake in the existing order." That's what happened in Germany in the early part of last year—the population went Nazi because most people had nothing to lose in an over-turn, and might gain something. And that's what is going to happen elsewhere if the present condition of world affairs goes on unchanged! This is what terrifies us in Mr. Haskell's statement above quoted, for what he says of Germany in the last "two distressful decades," may well be true of other countries in the next "two distressful decades," or even in the next two distressful years. Men are everywhere getting "hopeless." If the NRA fails in any appreciable measure, and the present prospect of a breakdown in public relief this winter actually comes true, men will get "hopeless" here. What we fear at this moment more than anything else is reaction from the extravagant hopes cultivated by the Roosevelt administration.

Postmaster General "Jim" Farley has stated that Mr. Roosevelt is an anti-inflationist. This is encouraging as far as it goes, for Mr. Farley is a politician of the cheapest type and would not be interpreting his chief as opposed to inflation unless he believed that such attitude was in accord with the sentiment of the country. The trouble is that purely political commitments of this sort do not last long, especially if conditions undergo change. Of course Mr. Farley has no convictions on the money question, and if the President has any, he has never revealed what they are. Furthermore, suppose he is *really* an anti-inflationist! What of it? We haven't a doubt that the man caught in the torrent of the Niagara River was an anti-Niagara Falls man. In the midst of the forces which Mr. Roosevelt has let loose in this country, what chances are there of his being able, even with the best will and firmest conviction in the world, to prevent this nation being swept over the foaming torrent of inflation? As a writer in the New York *World-Telegram* put it the other day —"Inflation is not coming. It is already *here.*" How far is it going, is now the only question. And this question all hangs upon the 31 billion dollar debt in 1936, the stage of industrial recovery at that same date, and the ability of the country to carry its unprecedented burden. Our own opinion is that recovery will not have advanced to any very wonderful heights two years hence, that any real attempt to handle the debt will lead the government to the printing press and the nation to ruin. The largest debt in our history simply presents us with an alternative—either we pay the debt by a

capital levy, or else we repudiate it altogether. Personally, if we were a rich man who was investing in bonds and caring for nothing but the security and the profitableness of our money, we wouldn't be any too happy these days.

The CWA has hired one hundred and fifty unemployed actors in New York, and set them to work producing a series of twelve plays. The same branch of official government relief is mobilizing musicians, and paying them good wages to give concerts here and there. Already, under the influence of Washington's magic wand, mural painters are splashing the walls of school-houses, city halls, and other public buildings. We record these facts not to complain. On the contrary, we think that one of the greatest things to be said of the Roosevelt administration is that it has recognized and acted upon the principle that the government is responsible for the health and happiness of its people. If the economic system has broken down and can't give men and women a living, it is not enough to make such innocent victims of social disorder the almoners of charity. Government must step in and itself provide decent and self-respecting employment! This is something new in our American history, and well entitles Roosevelt and his advisers to a deathless meed of praise. But a policy so wise and beneficent should know no restrictions. If applied to one group of struggling and starving citizens, as we have already pointed out, it should be applied to all. If actors, musicians, painters are helped, then, why not ministers? Thousands of first-class leaders in the churches, young as well as old, are idle. These are capable and devoted men, eager for public service. They could open closed churches, conduct lecture-courses, organize religious and social service work, teach and preach. Why should they not be given a wage, and released on the community? We have just heard of a committee of writers who are going to Washington to insist that the CWA gather in idle authors, and set them to work running magazines and writing books. We suggest that a committee of ministers be formed to do the same for their brethren.

The government at Washington again did a thing so wise that the courage of it is wellnigh unnoticed, in admitting Emma Goldman to this country for a three months' visit. This distinguished woman will be entering the United States about the time this editorial will be printed, and we take this opportunity, therefore, to bid her "welcome home." In doing this act of courtesy, we confess ourself no anarchist, in the philosophical or any other sense. But in this age of tyrannical governments, bloody dictatorships, military imperialisms, corrupt politics, unbearable taxation, and crumbling democracy, we think there is something to be said for the argument of less government and better men. Furthermore, on the basis of the sound Anglo-Saxon principle of "His Majesty's Opposition," we find the anarchistic philosophy an invaluable corrective of the socialistic tendencies now everywhere dominant. Yes, whatever our own opinions, we think that the world lost something when anarchism surrendered to communism its place on the extreme left of social thought. But however this may be, we think of Emma Goldman not so much as an anarchist as a great and heroic woman. In the realm of intelligence, she is to be numbered among the greatest women of our time. Ethically, she has proved her integrity in years of unfaltering fidelity to her convictions. As a champion of human rights, she has fought with leonine courage and endurance. As the friend of the downtrodden and oppressed, the persecuted and forsaken, she has suffered torments which rank her high among the martyrs of history. Men's hatred and fear of Emma Goldman has been for a generation the measure of her power. If our readers have doubts as to her spiritual stature, let them read her autobiography, "Living My Life." For years Emma Goldman carried the cross of a nation's scorn and abuse; now, on this visit, let her wear the crown of men's acclaim of valor and devotion.

We never cease to marvel at our newspapers, and their judgment as to the relative values of news. A fortnight or so ago, there died in New York a man by the name of David Lamar, famous in his day as "the Wolf of Wall Street." He was a man of evil reputation even on the exchange—a conscienceless robber, who took Wall Street at its word and played its game for all it was worth. His unscrupulousness became notorious—also, his ruthlessness. His record was adorned with two prison sentences. Vulgar, dishonest, greedy, an exploiter of chance in his own interest and to the ruin of all not cleverer or crueller than himself, Lamar ran his course, and disappeared. Then suddenly he died, in penniless obscurity—and the New York *Times* and newspapers of similar character published the news of his passing in long front-page stories! A fortnight or so earlier, another man died. This man was a man of international fame in the field of literature, whose books had been published in many languages. He was himself a genius, and certain of his writings are destined to immortality. His life also had been dramatic, and his last days sensational. Yet the story of Jacob Wassermann's death got no front-page space. On the contrary, it was tucked away in the inside obituary page, for those to find it who could. We suppose our professional journalists know their business. They probably understand the 12-year-old average intelligence of the general public. But some of our papers pretend at least to have standards and to recognize values. Why should these feature Lamar, and just notice Wassermann? It carries our mind back to the day when Rudolf Valentino and Charles William Eliot died, and the movie star, and not the first Amer-

ican citizen of his day, got all the space. Such a phenomenon is so vulgar as to be nauseating. It makes one not care a hang whether a world in which such things are possible, is saved or not.

It is interesting these days to pick up the morning newspaper, and read the following "Lost" advertisements:

$1,500 REWARD

for return of fancy diamond bracelet containing approximately 270 diamonds as follows: 30 square or emerald cut diamonds, 78 baguette diamonds, 162 round diamonds lost Thursday evening, Nov. 9, from Simplon Club, 26 W. 53d, to Biltmore Hotel, 43d and Madison av., and vicinity. J. A. Kennedy, 123 William st., BEekman-3-8870.

$100 REWARD

Straightline flexible bracelet, alternate blocks, 3 diamonds, 4 sapphires, etc.; lost November 15, between 91st and 42d sts., 2d to 6th avs., subway, street or taxi. W. H. Soper, 82 Beaver st. BEekman-3-5987.

$100 REWARD

Lost in front of 161 East 70th, at 7:30 p. m., November 17, two joined diamond and sapphire clipped pins on a brown hat. Return to above address. Adee.

$100 REWARD

10 pieces of jewelry contained in ladies' green leather handbag, lost Nov. 14 vicinity Park av. and 83d st. Return to J. A. Lyons, A. R. Lee & Co., 116 John st. BEe.-3-0280.

$75 REWARD

Bracelet, platinum, flexible, containing 39 diamonds, lost Nov. 13 between 34th and 59th sts., Altman's, Sloan's, Bloomingdale's or Schrafft's. H. L. Smith, A. R. Lee & Co., 116 John st. BEekman-3-0280.

$50 REWARD

Platinum chain bracelet with medal, 28 diamonds and medal, 15 diamonds and 15 onyx, lost in New York, Nov. 10 to 12, or on Albany train. H. J. Payne, A. R. Lee & Co., 116 John st., BEekman-3-0280.

These notices were published in a city which has some six millions of inhabitants with a half million unemployed and their dependents. Hordes of hungry men and women walk the streets, or stand in line before relief-stations and cheap "hand-outs," and at night hide away like shivering rats in any corner that will shelter them. Thousands of stricken families, starving, miserable and fear-beset, subsist upon such doles as distracted charity can gather and distribute this fourth year of the great depression. Tenements reek with the desperateness of the poor, and a myriad homes, never in trouble before, now watch and wait in vain for help. And in this city, itself bankrupt, are those who have huge rewards to spend for the blazing baubles of vanity! One stands amazed before such impudent exposure of luxury in the midst of want. How dare these economic wastrels thus flaunt their wealth before the eyes of the multitudes who know not where the next meal is coming from? But deeper than any question of individual morality is the social problem involved—the problem of a civilization which allows the few to wear fancy diamond bracelets, diamond and sapphire clipped pins, chain bracelets and other jewelry, while the vast majority of men and women struggle feverishly, and on the whole unsuccessfully, to get the grim basic necessities of physical existence. That nobody should have luxuries (if at all!) until everybody has necessities seems to us to be an elementary proposition. Hence our enthusiasm for Russia, whatever its failures, errors and crimes! Among the Soviets this is at least true—that nobody can have cake till everybody has bread, nobody silks until everybody has cotton, nobody two rooms until everybody has at least one. Our idle rich may not like this kind of Utopia, but by heaven, a little more advertising of diamond bracelets these days, and they'll get it!

Behind the Scenes at Geneva

If one wishes to understand what is going on at Geneva, he will do three things:

1. As he walks along the Quai du Mont Blanc he will look up at the Mountain, symbol of Eternity, which speaks to him patience and faith in truth. "I will lift up my eyes to the Mountain, whence cometh help."

2. As he crosses the long bridge over the Rhone—the Pont du Mont Blanc—he will recall that just a little below was once a bridge which Julius Caesar fifty-eight years before Christ destroyed to keep back the Helvetians from molesting Rome. He will note also that, a little later, in humble quarters in a Roman province, was born a child who disputed authority in Caesar's Empire. When we think of Caesar and Jesus together beginning their kingdoms, we find that we are with Jesus. This will help to understand Geneva.

3. As he sails on the Lake or walks around the City, he will see from all directions the spire of the Cathedral planted high on the Hill of the old town. He will think of Calvin and what started in Geneva back in the middle of the 16th century. It will refresh his memory to stand before the massive Reformation Monument—with figures of Calvin, Knox, Roger Williams, Cromwell and others—and recall that the Geneva City under Calvin was the beginning of modern democracy—begun by refugees and in obscurity. There would have been no English, no American Reformation, had Calvin and his comrades not started their City, in which the Bible—not Pope, not King—was the guidebook and conscience was authority. Here came Knox, fleeing Scotland and preached to the refugees, translated the Bible, which was carried to Holland, to Britain. It came with the Pilgrims to the New World. Roger Williams was taught in the Institutes of Calvin. Calvin was the Marx of his day. (Calvin and Marx are much alike in their creed of "determinism.") The thing to remember as one thinks of this great work is that it was begun by an obscure few, who put their backs against the wall, faced bishops and nobles and

fashioned their lives (if allowed to live) by the rule of conscience. Here was the beginning of modern democracy and free institutions.

Daily recollection of these three things will help one to understand the League of Nations and the Conference for the Reduction of Armament.

One should go representing some newspaper like UNITY, that has a demand for the exact, scientific truth—to sit in the press gallery has much advantage—and without prejudice politically, socially or religiously. He will wish to discover exactly what is being done and why; what is the dominant power; what prospects for results and what results. He will discover that there are two institutions in Geneva—independent but intimately blending—*The League of Nations* and the *Conference for Disarmament.* There are about fifty nations in each of these institutions—mostly the same in both, with the exception of a few nations like U. S. A. and U. S. S. R. not being in the League, but being in the Conference.

The League of Nations will be observed first. It is the creature of the Peace Treaty of Versailles and was supposed to furnish an organization for preserving the peace of the world. On the lower side of the Lake—about a 10 minutes walk from the long bridge—is an old office building that houses the "Secretariat," or political wing of the League. This is the business end. Another ten minutes walk will bring one to the "Labor" wing of the League—given over to statistics, etc., but without political power. A little further away—in the hills—there is in process of building a grand structure to house the League, with for example a million dollar library—for which the Rockefellers have contributed a good part.

The League has about a thousand employees—half in each wing—the Secretary-General being the all important official. There are two annual meetings—one is of Assembly, the other is of the Labor wing in Conference. The Assembly is the important body, meets in September, elects the members of the Council, which is the Executive Committee of the League—in short, runs the affairs of the League. The Council meets once a month, or on call. There are fifteen members in this Council—five of them (when we were in Geneva) are permanent, chosen by their own governments—Britain, France, Japan, Italy, Germany—the remainder serve for three years, the rule of rotation being observed by the members of the League. This Council—save when in private meeting—sit around a square table not more than ten feet from an observer. There is plenty of chance to see and hear. One translation is always given—French or English.

What does this Council—the Executive Board of the League—consider and do? About everything from the South to the North Pole. The big powers—markedly Britain with France second—control. In the first place the Council is undemocratic, power by the very composition of the Council being vested in the big Powers. If there ever was dominion of political aristocracy, it obtains at this Council Board.

This Council—perhaps the most important in the world—is the permanent Executor of the spoils of the War. No wonder the big Powers insist on being *permanent* members. In order to understand the work and power of the Council, one only needs to get a map issued by the League of Nations Union, which is a map of the world. The vast wholesale robberies that Britain, France and Italy and Japan committed—called by the euphonious name of Mandates—are down on it in Red, Blue and Gray. The Treaty of Versailles did a bad piece of criminal surgery on Europe and robbed the conquered nations of territory more than equal to that of the United States. Sit in with the writer while the Council takes up a few problems—there were a dozen others like these!

(a) *Irak.* A Mandate of the "A" class handed over to Britain at Britain's request. To be held under tutelage for 25 years. This is the old Mesopotamia, famous to Bible students. Here is where the Three Wise Men followed the "Star in the East." It is now noted for its oil wells. The Council under British suggestions thought that Irak was ready for independence. It was so moved and carried, and after a few months Irak was made independent, and received into the League of Nations. One does not need to be cynical to observe that Irak forms the link between Palestine and the Persian Gulf, and thus British planes may fly direct from the Mediterranean to India—Britain not neglecting to make treaties with Irak (independent) that continued certain police and judicial powers that had been worked out when Britain was the Mandatory Power. It is not surprising that the morning after Irak became independent in Geneva, the organization of a British Oil Company was published in the London papers. And, this is not an exception. It may be taken as a precedent for bringing Mandates out of tutelege to independence!

(b) *Persia.* One morning the newspapers of the world announced that the government of Persia expected to annul its oil contract with Britain. Eden of the British government (Eden is a suggestive name for that part of the earth) declared that Persia would be given three days to change her mind—meanwhile the prows of warships (British) were reported as being pointed north in the Gulf. "Here is a case for the League," said the public. It was threshed out before the Council. It took a few months for travel from Persia to Geneva. We feel certain that Britain who had publicly blustered over it and who dominates the League was not dissatisfied with the findings.

(c) *The London Economic Conference.* We saw that initiated and saw the reason why it was a failure as so many of the propositions made by John Simon are. How long the idea of holding a world's economic conference was simmering we do not know. Certainly it

came suddenly to light. Simon is chairman of the important committee on finance of the Council of the League. One day—a few months before the London Conference convened—he moved that a World's Economic Conference be called—it being understood (1) that the Conference should be held in *London* (2) that the Prime Minister of Great Britain should be its *president* (3) that the chairman of the finance committee of the Council—that is to say Simon—should be the chairman of the *agenda committee* of the London Conference. Even at this late date we are unable to name any important position that was overlooked for the British to hold. Simon was the first one to run away from the London Conference, as it began to fall down. He took a trip to Brazil.

(d) *Liberia.* This small African land came several times before the Council. America has interests in Liberia because of the Firestone rubber lands and because Americans helped in the formation of the government. The British evidently do not like the way things are managed and they also have interests in the Rubber plantations. Cecil of Britain—who is also head of the peace propaganda for the English-speaking world at the same time representing Britain as delegate to both Conference and the Council—had the affairs of Liberia in leading-strings. Here it is rubber—in Irak and Persia it is oil—we noted that when any question was up over mandates where such riches were involved—the representative of Britain was conspicuous. It was the same in problems of strife in South America, in whose settlement the United States was interested—the Council of the League acted as a competitor, not as cooperator. The Council seemed jealous of its activities, whenever any nation not in the League showed concern. There was something of the "rule or ruin" spirit.

(e) *Japan.* The whole world knows the story of the tragedy in the Far East. It began to get clear to all observers that the Council of the League was handling the matter with strange ineptitude. Such delays. Always "putting off till tomorrow" the putting out of a conflagration that threatened the world. Such sidestepping not only by Japan but by England and France who had it in their power to stop the strife! In it all America was thrown by France and England into a position of irritation—whereas America made the only direct and honest effort to stop the strife.

The Conference for the Reduction of Armaments. This is the other institution that one observes at Geneva. It has lasted for two years, and is going—no one knows where. For three months a Peace Proposal—offered by Macdonald of Britain—has been carried around in the inside pocket of Henderson, the President! In childish fashion he is threatening to resign—to "take his doll and go home." One defect in this Proposal is that Britain has no proposition to disarm herself. And, yet there will be no disarmament until the Anglo-Saxon leads—and, with a deep cut.

Two years ago it seemed as if a great peace was to be born on earth. The Youth, the Women, the Workers—from everywhere—gave utterance at Geneva to their hopes and demands. Social, religious and educational forces were organized — for propaganda, for action. Then came the great Betrayal. The Christians failed to throw power upon the Conference. The Public rested back in reliance too much on opinion. Weeks, months passed by—and these were marked by delays, subterfuge, deceptions. France was the first to make a concrete proposition: that of international police. This was defeated—although we have noticed recently that the British Cabinet has been considering the idea of an international police. Then came Russia's proposition of total disarmament, or very drastic reduction leading up to total disarmament within five years. Strange to say, there were only two votes for this proposal! . . . Then came the "Hoover Proposals"—really a concrete plan, with a ⅓ or ¼ cut. This meant a road to real disarmament. This plan was killed chiefly by Britain —and when the Proposition was buried in a Resolution of words—it was the day, the first time, that Germany walked out of the Conference. This had much to do with what has happened in Germany since!

So the Conference has gone from bad to worse. One is led to draw several conclusions: (a) There is no chance for agreement except in a Draft Convention, which will be no more for world-peace than the Treaty of Versailles was for world-peace. (b) To get a Permanent Disarmament Commission functioning at Geneva will be to put the world in bondage for a generation. The Anglo-Saxon, i. e. Britain, will be in control. Every nation should oppose the creation of a Pax Britannica. (c) It should be shouted from the housetops that the Anglo-Saxon should begin disarmament by setting the example! Anything else is hypocrisy. And to start out with any other idea—the Conference should do what the Economic Conference did—admit its failure, and go home. We are not looking for Henderson to resign, nor for the League "to fail." The situation—because of its failures and weakness—makes it easier for the Anglo-Saxon in the business of dominating the earth.

As our eyes turn to Geneva, and in imagination look up to Mount Blanc, and recall the days when Caesar destroyed the Bridge over the River—two things are reaffirmed!

Immediate total disarmament is the only way for the nations to take.

To the Anglo-Saxon belongs the power and therefore the crime of neglect and failure.

SYDNEY STRONG.

Jottings

The Pope is opposed to sterilization. Yet in his own church thousands of men are annually sterilized by admitting them into a celibate priesthood.

Business advertisements are always interesting. A friend informs us of two signs which can be seen in New York. On East 13th Street:

"Rev.....
Marriage Performer"

And on West 43rd Street:

"Bargain Sale of Husbands"

Women should be interested in both cases!

Five bank-robbers and bandits, recently captured in Illinois, are 20, 24, 20, 20, and 18 years of age respectively. American criminals are not men but boys. What are we going to do about it?

The bill in Congress providing for an American poet-laureate seems a rather nice idea—until you recollect that, if the bill were passed, Eddie Guest or Walt Mason would probably get the appointment.

During the last campaign, it was the custom in certain circles to speak of Roosevelt the Great (Theodore) and Roosevelt the Little (Franklin D.) Times, now, have changed. Who knows but what, a century hence, Theodore Roosevelt will be remembered as a President who happened to have the same name as Franklin D. Roosevelt?

It is announced, in connection with James A. Farley's retirement from his party posts, that "it is his intention to devote himself to his duties as head of the Post Office Department." Wonderful—the Postmaster General proposes to earn his salary!

J. H. H.

The Oxford Group Today*

On October 7th in historic St. Paul's Cathedral, London, before a crowded congregation of 6,000 the Bishop of London commissioned a group of men and women who then and there gave themselves to the task of making Jesus Christ real in every phase of London life this autumn and winter. After prayer and thanksgiving, after Dean Inge had read the Lesson and the Metropolitan of India had given the address, the Group or "team" of those to be commissioned was presented by Dr. Frank N. D. Buchman in the following words: "Reverend Father in God—Bid a blessing upon those who go forth in the name of Christ, that they may rejoice in the power of the Holy Spirit." And there, as the Bishop proceeded to the Chancel step, arose not ten or fifteen or fifty trained and ready team-members, but 600.

Numbers alone have never been the true index of Christ's power in the world, but they are significant. In the spring of 1927 a houseparty at Oxford numbered thirty-five or forty. A year ago the registration was about 800. Last July the Oxford houseparty topped 5,000—doctors, merchants, lawyers, brokers, clergymen, representatives of the army and navy, social workers, engineers, unemployed men and women, agriculturists, politicians, teachers, students. Moreover, it was an international, not a British, gathering. California and Canada, as well as Switzerland and Holland, had their quota. Sixty came from South Africa; one man travelled all the way from New Zealand. Here, in the six colleges taken over by the Group, people from more than forty different lands met together. An outstanding leader in the Church of England wrote the London *Times* subsequently:

My proposed visit of four days was extended to eight, and not only was I deeply impressed by the wonderful works of God which I there witnessed, but I personally received, as a result of the challenge which was faithfully presented, a heightened vision of what God was able to accomplish through me, did I offer no obstacle of unbelief or self-will to the guidance of his spirit.

Shortly after Oxford, houseparties were also held in South Africa, Canada, Holland, Switzerland, and Germany. In the depression year of 1932-1933 an overseas team of fifty to sixty visited New York, Washington, Akron, Detroit, Chicago, Kansas City, Phoenix, Los Angeles, and San Francisco, as well as the leading cities of Canada; and everywhere they went, scores of changed, redirected lives were the result. They visited schools and colleges as well as churches. In Vancouver, 30,000 heard them on a single Sunday. Meetings, "schools of life," groups large and small, are scattered far and wide in our own country. Forty-one Americans have been on trek this autumn in the Southern States. One Group book, "For Sinners Only," by A. J. Russell, has already passed the 150,000 mark and been translated into many foreign languages.

So grows a modern movement of the spirit of the living God. And the answer, the explanation, is not hard to find. Whenever men and women have given themselves fully enough to God, something always happens—something tremendous. It was so in the first century, when the change of a few men and women meant Christ circling the Mediterranean. It was so in the fourth century, when the dedication of one man, Ulfila, opened God's way among the Germanic tribes. It was so in the thirteenth century, when the utter self-abandon of Francis of Assisi sent troops of joyous witnesses across Europe under a veritable gale of the Spirit. It is commonly believed that, in the power of God, John Wesley saved England from industrial revolution. Many recognize the same phenomenon in the world today—a new outpouring of the power of God, dating from the day on which an American Lutheran clergyman made a rededication of himself—a complete surrender of himself—to God.

*This article is the seventh in the series "Trends in Present-Day Religion," which began in issue of November 13, 1933. The author first came into touch with the Oxford Group in Peiping, China, where he served as English instructor and Y. M. C. A. Secretary, 1917-1919. In 1924 he went out with Dr. F. N. D. Buchman, founder of the Groups, on one of the first traveling "teams," visiting mission stations in the Far East. Since 1925, he has been rector of Calvary Protestant Episcopal Church, New York City.

When Frank Buchman experienced the change in his life which has since been multiplied in the lives of thousands all over the world, he had first to face more concretely than he had ever done before the un-Christ-like elements in his own life. In a little village church in England, at a time of spiritual dryness and powerlessness, he heard a woman speak simply about the Cross. Against the vision of Christ's sacrifice, he saw his own divided will, pride, and selfishness in a new light. They were sins, not because society labeled them "taboo," but because they stood between him and that vision. That was what sin was—anything, *anything* which was a barrier between God and himself, between other men and himself. That was what Christ offered forgiveness for. The first half of surrender was a break with sin.

Henry Drummond left us a classic explanation of sin in his illustration of the old water-wheel he used to pass as a boy on the way to school. Although the river flowed close by, cool and swift, the wheel was often motionless. He discovered that it was only when the miller came and raised the sluice-gate that things began to happen. As the barrier was lifted, the force of the stream touched the blades of the great wheel, and it began to turn.

The life of the average man or woman is blocked somewhere. It may not be a conscious estrangement from God; the sin may be the spiritual blindness of Nicodemus as easily as the immorality of the woman taken in adultery. That each may see for himself the true picture of his own life, we turn to the historic Jesus—that perfect figure is as a mirror in which to see our own imperfections. We say something like this—"No matter what else you see in the person of Jesus, you see a sinless perfection growing out of absolute purity, absolute honesty, absolute unselfishness, and absolute love. Whatever stands out in your own life as the reverse of these absolutes must be given to God, must be forgiven by him. Do not hesitate to call a spade a spade. He will not leave you as you are. Do your part and you will find him already doing his."

Recently I talked with a woman who had been seeking God for years. She had found some strength in prayer, in turning her mind towards him, in dwelling on his power and his love. But there were problems in her life unsolved, needs which had never been met. "They tell me I'm all right," she said, "when as a matter of fact I'm not." She was like the house-owner whose house had bad drains and a broken furnace, who tried desperately to maintain a healthy atmosphere in the home merely by raising the curtains to the sun and opening the windows for fresh air.

There is no single type for which this holds true. Honesty and surrender mark the gateway to the new life in the case of both the newsboy and the so-called captain of industry. On last year's traveling team were a British Admiral who served all through the war, an ex-Communist labor organizer from Fifeshire, Scotland, a former Moderator of the Presbyterian Church in South Africa, a German school-mistress, a Dutch baroness, teachers and students, business men and housewives. In Montreal, a publisher was changed and paid back to the government $12,200 of customs evasions. In California forty prisoners in one great jail gave their lives to Christ and began witnessing to their fellow-inmates. Recently an official in that jail wrote saying, "We are conscious that the influence of the Oxford Group has changed the whole atmosphere of the prison."

With sin faced and forgiven the next step can be taken. God can guide. By "guidance" I mean that direction which the Holy Spirit gives the moment we do our part fully. In some degree the Spirit guides all of us; but when, with a frank knowledge of his sin, man gives over not merely time and strength, but his very right to himself, without reservation and without compromise, there then comes, besides new power, a spiritual discernment he has not known before. It is the difference between the first and the second chapters of the Book of Acts. God's will becomes clear, not merely in relation to what we think of as the "great" decisions of life; practically in the countless questions of daily living, his guidance becomes the deciding factor. We discover a plan for our lives, as different in even its details as manhood is from childhood.

A third element in this life is the inevitable "witnessing" which results—the passing of it on to the next fellow. Jesus told his disciples that he intended to make them fishers of men and he did so. In the early Christian church there was a note of discovery and a sense of expectancy. Men and women had found something which was altogether too good to keep to themselves. They had found a friend. What could be more natural than to tell others about him? What could be more important? And so they marched over the land telling others the "good news" and helping them to find and appropriate a similar experience.

This is normal Christianity—to talk naturally of those experiences which mean the most to oneself. Normal discipleship means the conquest of fear and of undue reserve; normal life in the Spirit cuts across lone-wolfing. A good many people have failed to realize this. They have sat back waiting for others to come to them and raise the question, or they have hidden their experience like a jewel in a casket to be examined in private and occasionally exhibited. One day they have gone to the casket and found it empty.

This is a part of "sharing." It consists in giving away the best that you know. It means taking the trouble to learn how to impart life, as opposed to talking about religion in general. It involves time. It requires honesty, both about oneself and the other person. It leads one to speak of one's own struggles, defeats, and victories, for what a friend wants to see is not simply your achivements but your growth. The most important point of all is "how did you get that way."

This is a message for others in need which does not consist in "advice," but in tested experience. As our own problems are solved in Christ's way, and as we find fellowship with others in whose lives he is also at work, a corporate experience of him is achieved. And as this moves and spreads, dozens, then hundreds, then thousands, come under his sway. So, we believe, will the kingdom of this world become the Kingdom of our Lord and of his Christ.

Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt said in a recent address:

It seems to me that unless we have a great spiritual revival, a rededication to unselfishness, there is very little hope for a permanent change. I think we feel today that only as the people reawaken to a real desire to live what religion teaches, will we be able to make a different world.

The Oxford Group sees that reawakening in person after person. We believe that the great spiritual revival has already begun. "Changed lives are the raw material of the new world order." The vision of the Group, in part already realized, is life-changing that will change the world. SAMUEL M. SHOEMAKER.

Costs of College

Thousands who seek higher education are not able to get it. Thousands whom society needs as leaders and cultural epoch-makers, are not being equipped for the part. The depression has aggravated this condition, and shocked many indifferent observers into realizing that something must be done which is not now attempted, but the depression did not create the condition. Discerning observers saw what was amiss in the heyday of prosperity. Costs of college training have long deprived many capable young people of adequate preparation for service, and countless others have struggled to their hurt against mounting financial odds.

Maybe the actual and total costs of education are not too great. Maybe college buildings are not too imposing and sumptuous. Maybe college professors and administrative officers are not being paid too high salaries. Maybe the executive and clerical work in administrative offices is efficiently and economically carried on. Maybe college facilities are too largely appropriated by spendthrifts from opulent homes who go to college with no worthy purpose. Such questions do not touch the present point. That point is that multitudes of students who do get to college press on at the expense of their own crippled usefulness, and by imposing burdens which are crushing their homes. The struggle for the young man or woman is so severe and the burden upon the home is so great as to disbar other multitudes. Costs are misplaced; that much is clear. Maybe our society is rich enough to educate all who deserve education, but no one can avoid the conclusion that the adjustment of costs is inefficient.

Maybe educators are waiting to hear a more determined word from those who are suffering most directly from this maladjustment, that is, from serious-minded students and their homes. Let us assume that they wish to hear from us, any way, and press the discussion from that point of view.

A thousand dollars a year is coming to be the standard cost to the student and his home. Many students are getting through on less, and some institutions which make this possible do not seriously cheapen their academic training. But many students are spending more, and are expected by the college to do so. The fixed charges of standard institutions which operate under the refectory-dormitory system are a thousand dollars, and run above in notable cases.

The average per capita expenditure in certain types of institutions is said to be twenty-five hundred dollars, but this average often includes spendthrifts whose extravagance is condemned by the college authorities, however ineffectually it is restrained. One large metropolitan university sets the necessary expenditures per student at the minimum of one thousand dollars, and lists in a parallel column the expenditures expected of the average student which total $1,250. Another university in a neighboring city closely estimates the total for women at $977 and for men at $920, adding in italics, "These amounts cover only fixed charges," and intimating that no totals of necessary cost will come under a thousand, while $1,300 or $1,500 are more likely to be normal.

There are creditable colleges where, especially since the depression has forced economies, this total is said to be cut in half, or even reduced below that point. But fixed charges alone are likely to be included in these estimates, whereas the student encounters additional necessary expenses which require just as real money as tuition and board.

There is no occasion to labor this estimate. Whatever be the total, it is too much for many who are struggling under the load, and for many others who do not even try to carry it.

What have the homes of the land to suggest that educators shall do about this? First, let us find out what educators are already doing.

For one thing, they are carrying higher education to the community where the homes are located, and are making it possible to secure academic training of college grade on the same cost basis as elementary and secondary education. The glory of the American public school system from the start has been that elementary education is brought within the reach of all children. Little red school houses dotted the landscape, and one was found within longer or shorter walking distance of practically every child even in pioneer days. Then came consolidated schools, fewer in number but vastly improving the education supplied, and made even more accessible than the old one-teacher schools through free daily transportation between home and school.

There has been amazing progress during the present generation in making the high school scarcely less accessible. An increasing majority of all American young people can now remain at home and secure superior secondary training. Latterly the major cities have gone farther. Junior colleges are added to the public school system in numbers of cases, and a few cities now provide a full college course under public auspices. Even where the city college or university is partially or wholly supported by subscription or endowment, often no tuition is charged local students.

This is wonderful. But two important considerations qualify the adequacy of this plan. In the first place, relatively few are thus favored. Only major cities can maintain creditable institutions, and these cannot be located where the majority of the homes, even of the city, can gain ready access. In the second place, a splendid American tradition in college education is being sacrificed in this development. It is well that the child, and boy and girl, should have the benefit of home training during their school days up to 17 or 18 years of age. It is by no means so well that they should remain at home for college training. Wise mothers wish to relax apron-strings by the time that age is reached. On the completion of his or her high school course the normal boy or girl is ready for a discipline in citizenship which the home cannot supply.

If the high school graduate goes to work, he becomes a member of the community at large, and is getting desirable discipline in citizenship, even though he may lodge at home for a time longer. He or she is taking a man's or a woman's part in the work-a-day world. If he or she continues as a student this discipline is lacking, and nothing takes its place. Babies should not be kept in high chairs too long. An eighteen-year-old student living at home suffers from the status of an overgrown child. When he leaves home for college he enters a community made for him, into whose activities he steps as a member in his own right, and whose processes he is expected more and more to control. The college student at home belongs to no community as a con-

structive factor. The community of which he is a part is in the complete control of adults, and he is not rated an adult, though he has attained adult years, nor is he vested with adult rights or duties.

Wise parents do not ordinarily want to keep their children at home for their college training. At home they miss something which college is meant to give them. City colleges and universities are doubtless well intended, and the movement to supply them is a prodigious display of civic pride. But college professors themselves often send their sons and daughters to colleges other than those of their home towns, when financial considerations permit.

Furthermore, city colleges and universities do not solve the problem of costs in many homes. The college student can doubtless live more cheaply at home than in a college dormitory or boarding-house, but he must live even there, and the cost of his maintenance is often a real problem. At home he continues to be the economic dead-head which all college students are, only a somewhat less expensive one.

Sending son or daughter away to college is not, therefore, merely a counsel of convenience. It is a feature of sound education. Educators feel this quite as much as if not more than parents. Dr. Nicholas Murray Butler is president of one of the outstanding metropolitan universities of the country. This type of institution never maintains complete dormitory equipment. It expects that a certain proportion of the students shall live at home or in residences not controlled by the institution. But even Dr. Butler has this to say of college community life: Halls of residence are provided

> precisely as laboratories, libraries and teachers themselves, in order to exert educational influence and to offer educational opportunity. . . . It is not merely by individual attendance upon lectures or recitations or by individual work in laboratories or in libraries that one can gain the full benefit of University membership. That comes, and can only come, when the individual student regards himself and treats himself as a member of the academic family to which he owes companionship and loyal allegiance and from which, in turn, he may gain untold advantage through personal social and academic contacts of many kinds which would otherwise be beyond his reach.

The upshot of the matter is that the student is not really getting college training who does not live in nor fully identify himself with the community which is deliberately constructed for his benefit and which he is expected to help in maintaining. And the costs; that is our present point. What if the student has not the money? What if his parents have not the money? It makes a difference where the money comes from, if the real values of education are to be conserved.

This move of the educators is an evasion of the issue which we are pressing, and in the process some of the essential values of college training are sacrificed. The educator says: "Here is the college within ready access of the home; we engage to supply intellectual discipline, and there our responsibility ends. The student's practical economic problems are no concern of ours." Some educators go farther and declare also that the student's moral and social training are no concern of the college. The president of one of the largest metropolitan universities voiced this idea recently in a notable public address. He scoffed the notion that the university should be held responsible for any but the intellectual discipline of the student.

His university, like practically all even of his type, maintains dormitories for a limited number of out-of-town students, but he and those for whom he speaks would depart radically from the view of Dr. Butler, who was quoted above. This group of educators would employ dormitories simply as lodgings, conveniences for those who cannot live at home, a concession to an unfortunate social condition.

It is not likely that students generally nor their parents will accept this theory of college training nor willingly submit to the program which it projects.

Another proposal of certain educators is likewise an evasion of the issue which we are raising, at least in its fundamental aspects. This proposal is that college admissions be restricted and enrollments be cut down by the elimination of those applicants who cannot produce evidence of having the financial resources to meet costs imposed by the institution's prescribed program. One of the executives of the oldest university in the country advanced this proposal in a notable document within the year, and the plan has been advocated less definitely by many educators. Only the other day a father was telling me of a visit to one of the leading colleges for women, seeking to arrange for his daughter's entrance. Her mother is a graduate of that college, and he is a highly educated and successful professional man. His salary is generally esteemed very satisfactory. He came away from his visit with the distinct impression that his daughter is not wanted. Costs put that college out of his daughter's economic class.

There is a widespread feeling that college admissions should be more rigorously restricted. Some are going to college who cannot gain the benefits which college training provides. They are wasting their time, building up false hopes, retarding the progress of fellow-students, exhausting to no purpose the energies of teachers and the financial resources of the colleges. May be this point is well taken. Before the question is settled the public will likely have a good deal to say from the point of view of the community as a whole, and especially will the community have much to say about the tests employed to determine who shall be admitted and who shall be excluded.

One of the tests which the American public will not accept is that here proposed, namely that the boy and girl shall be shut out who come from homes where the male parent may chance not to have developed sufficiently aggressive impulses to have accumulated his "pile," while free access to college shall be accorded those young people who do have back of them a home of affluence. The American community is not going to allow the "poor boy" to be put off in that summary fashion. Many of the rich will rise up to join the protest against any such program, and will scorn even the tendency, if educators talk too loudly or generally to this effect.

Even the administrator to whom I referred above does not propose that all poor boys shall be shut out of college. All endowed colleges have been entrusted with funds provided expressly to help such students. The proposal is that the admissions from among the poor are to be limited to those for whom these available funds provide, with strict limitation of their numbers lest they disrupt the normal program which requires applicants to appear with the price in hand. Undoubtedly educators do wisely in dissipating the false notion that just any poor boy can "work his way through college," that all required is the will, and that some magic will open the way. Parents of balanced judgment will heartily support those educators who are

seeking to discourage visionary hopes among those who go to college with no resources back of them. But when an educational program is proposed which identifies our aristocracy of culture and professional training with an hereditary aristocracy of wealth, the traditional American spirit will assert itself, and vigorous protests will be heard from real Americans, rich and poor alike.

Here are large questions which we cannot follow to satisfactory answers in our space, but it is apparent that this proposal is another evasion of the issue with which we are dealing. Here is to be found no hopeful solution of the costs of college training. Evasion of the problem will not do. Educators will have to think again.

Let us turn now to the several devices by which the issue is more directly met. Student loans are being provided in some volume, and are advocated in still larger. Many institutions maintain special funds contributed for this express purpose, generous individuals in uncounted numbers help in this way to see ambitious students through, and at least one large national foundation has for the past eleven years specialized in this field. Many an educated man and woman, now an active leader in society, testifies to the help by this means which alone made it possible for him or her to gain an education.

It does not detract from the real value of this provision, nor reflect upon the sincerity of those who encourage the method, to point out several evils which come of it, and to say that as a solution of the problem which we are considering it is altogether inadequate. Loans are valuable only as a supplement to some other and more constructive provision for student maintenance. To put on the finishing touch to a good job otherwise performed, to give the spent climber the final boost over the fence, loans have served well. But they have done a vast amount of mischief.

Loan funds are loosely administered as a rule. Defalcation is common, and little or nothing is done about it. Some college loan funds have been reported as suffering a loss from principal of forty, fifty and even sixty per cent, though I do not have exact statements before me. The national foundation referred to, after eleven years of experience, has this school year discontinued new loans, and will resume the practice, the director tells me, if at all, only to advanced graduate students bent on an approved line of fruitful research.

If loan money is advanced to the student under pretense of saving his self-respect, with no real intention of requiring collection, a serious moral injury is done him and the community. It seems to an enthusiastic young person a light matter to assume the obligation. Will not his education greatly enlarge his earning power over competitors? Of course he can pay back the loan in short order when he gets into business or into a highly paid profession! But the victim of this reasoning is sadly disillusioned when pay-day comes. He often defers payments, or defaults outright, and thus enters his career under a cloud. The last person in the community who should be encouraged to go into debt is the inexperienced, immature young fellow with the hard road of life before him. He will have heavy enough obligations to meet without mortgaging his career in advance.

The college graduate who steps forth burdened with debt must make money-getting his first and foremost concern, no matter what may have been the character of the professional or technical training which he has received. Often he has to forsake his chosen profession—only temporarily, he fondly assures himself—while he seeks a paying job in any line offering a surplus which will clear off his debt. This creative leader, this bold innovator, this daring initiator, trained at so much pains to inspire his community with ambitions to social progress, must first of all turn money-getter if not wage-slave, a status from which, in all too many cases, he never escapes. Volumes could be compiled, revealing the pernicious effects of student loans. It is fortunate that the method is not more commonly employed. As a solution of our problem it is altogether inadequate.

Well, then, how about scholarships? Under this system the money is given outright to the student, or, more often, certain fixed charges which other students are expected to pay are remitted or reduced. Many educators and rich individuals interested in education are much beholden to this method. Large endowments have been accumulated whose income is devoted to the purpose. Nothing must be said which will reflect upon the benevolent intentions and the free-handed generosity which are back of this system. Thousands of useful leaders in society today owe their training to scholarship provisions which alone made it possible for them to go to college.

But this is charity. The applicant for a scholarship must approach a benefactor, and ask a special boon. He must practice a high degree of intellectual docility and decorum if he would hope to hold on to his scholarship once he gets it. More and more educators insist that these benefactions shall be bestowed only upon those who have made a record in their preparatory work, and who maintain high scholastic standards throughout their college course. Is not this well? Oh, yes. Every student ought to do well in his classes, and study faithfully, and make good grades. Which is quite to the point: *every student* should be and do all this. Why hold this special club over the "poor boy"? Why brand him as an exception, the recipient of special favors, the "good" boy expected never to deviate from an impeccably docile temper when he faces his preceptors, simply because his dad chanced not to have cultivated the shrewdness or desire to grab his "pile" in a highly acquisitive and competitive society? This does not seem quite the way to cure the baneful effects of prevalent grab methods and the grab spirit which all wise educators and social philosophers so eloquently deplore. Scholarships are a feature of a patronage system, and they have the defects of that system. They do not accord with the spirit and aims of democracy. The reason they have not done more mischief than they have is because there are not enough of them, and they are not big enough, to do more.

The poor boy who has the real stuff in him can always "work his way through college"! So it is commonly believed. Thousands have done it. More thousands are now doing it. But if this is offered as a solution of our problem the educational program must be re-ordered to give the plan educational sanction and validity. In only a scattering few institutions of higher learning is recognition made in the institutional structure of the need or desirability of student self-help. Most or all of these would drop this feature if they could. Frontier conditions compelled a number of colleges to standardize their program around the student

who must provide his own resources for daily living, but so far as I am able to discover scarcely one of them has continued the plan beyond the absolute necessity of securing students. Everywhere concern for the student's economic requirements are esteemed and treated by the institution as a vexatious necessity to be evaded if at all possible.

In several outstanding institutions the depression has prompted the erection of new departments in "student aid." Placement service has been developed in most colleges on an unprecedented scale. This includes placing of undergraduates in remunerative jobs as well as the location of graduates in permanent positions. One university set apart $40,000 to provide for "made jobs" during last school year, and has duplicated the provision for the present season.

These are largely emergency measures, and are often so labeled. This kind of activity will be relaxed if not entirely abandoned, presumably, upon the return of "prosperity." The poor boy will then be left to shift for himself in the old way. For the most part this has been a root-hog-or-die policy. The boy who wins the struggle and finally completes his course is exuberantly patted on the back, but in the meantime the whole educational set-up is against him. He is treated as an exception. Academic schedules are shaped with little or no recognition of his necessities. His work he must fit in where and when he can, on his own initiative. For the most part he must find his own job, though, as already pointed out, the depression has prompted more active help at this point in many institutions. Rarely is any attempt whatever made to extract educational values from this necessity. College authorities pay lip-service to the poor boy's pluck in mastering the odds against him, but he gets plenty of official frowns over academic irregularities caused by his daily labor, and the vexation of college administrators over their enforced concessions to working students is not successfully concealed.

Here are opened large questions of educational policy. Our problem of student maintenance will not be effectively solved until these questions are faced much more squarely than they are being faced now. When they are so faced, and when the college accepts fully the responsibilities which the administration deliberately creates by erecting the college community, then our problem will be merged in the educational scheme itself, and will find a triumphant solution.

This is the major point which, it seems to me, we of the public should press. The college community must be set up and conducted in such a manner as to consume its own smoke, efficiently to utilize willing student energies in carrying their share of the economic load, to treat the process of living not as a necessary evil, but as an opportunity for joyous and enriching culture. The poor boy is not getting a square deal. Is the rich boy getting any better treatment? Maybe, in a careful analysis of his fate, he is getting worse. Some students, though approaching or past the age of full citizenship, are scarcely more self-sufficient economically than they were when as babes in their high-chairs a nurse fed them with a spoon. Is this culture? Is the community's cultural and professional life safe in the hands of leaders whose whole period of preparation is passed in enforced detachment from practical economic concerns, or whose contacts are embarrassed or positively aborted by official frowns and interference? Should not education be re-conceived and its programs re-cast, to cover more adequately the process of life training? How can a confirmed and officially approved parasitism be conceived as an adequate training for life in a democratic and inherently economic social order such as we are building in America?

Perhaps parents and the public should be more explicit in declaring what they want. We cannot prescribe technique, of course. Details of program must be determined by trained educators. We do not wish to see our liberal arts colleges converted into trade schools, nor our universities transformed into technological institutes. We do not want students to be snatching jobs from wage-earners in the community at large, thus taking the bread out of the mouths of needy families. We should not like to see our young people subjected to the educational devices of the shifty Mr. Squeers. Certain well-meant "industrial school" methods of the past have been fully demonstrated to have been ill-advised, and we heartily commend our educators of today for refusing to revert to them.

But we do believe that the time has come for educators generally to address themselves with real seriousness to the training of young people for life, the whole of life. We know of no effective way of learning how to live except by living, and students in our colleges are not living a full-rounded life. They are officially and determinedly put out of touch with some of the most vital demands of practical living. Surely citizens of 18 to 25 years of age should not be condemned to economic parasitism while by this process they are ostensibly trained for leadership in a democratic and essentially economic social order. There is no reassurance in being told that this is done in the interests of culture. That is not a true culture which demands or permits such a regimen.

We believe that our young people of today and tomorrow will more and more assert themselves in correction of this false attitude. We cannot forget that most of those features which make college life so attractive today were developed through the initiative of students themselves, often against official discouragement and resistance. The official classroom routine is not the charm of college life, nor does it embody the essential culture which our young people crave and actually get from college. The so-called extra-curricular activities, tardily admitted to organic recognition by college administrations, and still often running at loose ends from lack of efficient organization, nevertheless make college life what it is, in the conscious purpose of the students, even more than the class-room routine dominated by the faculty.

We find in this situation large promise for the solution of our problem. Allow the students to take hold. They will solve this problem with an effectiveness which no corps of bosses and superintendents and placement officers can aprpoach. The movement for co-operative houses, which the depression has inspired, and which is now spreading rapidly among many colleges is a tribute to the courage and resourcefulness of the present generation of students. It reveals a splendid loyalty to homes caught in the present distressing financial pinch. These co-operative projects do not solve our problems, but offer promise. They are only devices for saving; they do not satisfy the ambition, which all right-minded students must finally cherish, to be producers. But they do save expense. They are a sign that loyal sons and daughters are de-

termined to go easy on the parental bank-account though the draft may be only slightly reduced.

The movers in this project of co-operative houses doubtless do not themselves realize to what their effort may lead. With official encouragement and wise guidance their experiments will go far. The satisfaction of having lightened the load from their homes will eventually blossom into a sense of the dignity and self-respect of economic self-dependence, which will seem to these enlightened young people to be the very essence and the *sine qua non* of genuine culture.

Let us press this discussion until common counsels throw luminous beams upon a way which now is sadly shrouded in uncertainty and doubt. Means must be found to bring college training within reach of those who need it and who will return life-long benefits to society. That training must so far embrace the essential elements of living that it will be life itself. Educators are already at least paying lip-service to an educational philosophy which magnifies "learning by doing." Why can we not have a college culture which shall train for life by encouraging students to live an economically resourceful, not a parasitic life? Under official encouragement and sympathetic guidance, students themselves will find the way.

The reader can render good service by pressing this matter upon the attention of educators within his own circle of acquaintance. Let us think on through, and insist that a way be found.

JOSEPH ERNEST MCAFEE.

Commercializing the Churches

A group of business men with headquarters in Chicago have recently hit on a new scheme to make profits for themselves during the depression. It is called the Goodwin Plan and purports to aid the churches in meeting their financial obligations. A pamphlet put out by the organization appeals to the profit motivation of the churches and is headed "The Good News—Under the Goodwin Plan Churches May Now Receive Up to Thousands of Dollars per Year from a New Nation-wide Source." The pamphlet proceeds to show that if the church has "10 good news broadcasters" it will get $520 per year. If it can get "50 good news broadcasters" it will make $5,200. Apparently the good news of Jesus Christ seems to have been transmuted a long ways since the time of his sojourn in Galilee!

This plan deserves especial consideration because of the notable number of endorsements it has received from men of outstanding prominence in the church life of America. Father Ryan, of the Catholic University of Washington, for example, says in a telegram which has been broadcasted by the Goodwin Corporation:

> I accept with pleasure your invitation to act as a member of your Board of Arbitration for Social Justice. Your program is eminently fair to employer, employee and consumer. A progressive and important step toward restoring purchasing power to the mass market on a fair and effective basis. Congratulations.

Bishop George C. Stuart of Chicago says:

> Your advertising project which contemplates a profit to church organizations which participate through their members in the purchase of staple articles I have considered, and it seems to me to be a sound and proper one.

Dr. Ernest F. Tittle, the outstanding pastor of the First Methodist Church of Evanston at first enthusiastically endorsed the plan but after further study and investigation withdrew all support from it.

Bishop McConnell insists that all he did was to agree to serve as an arbitrator in case of an industrial dispute without any endorsement of the Goodwin plan as such. In spite of this his name has been printed by the tens of thousands and implies approval to the public.

Ralph W. Sockman of Christ Church of New York writes:

> The rush of the last few days has postponed my intention of writing you to express my approval of the Goodwin Plan. . . Furthermore, the Goodwin Plan will be a providential assistance at this particular time in the finances of many a parish. We are expecting to make use of it in our new Christ Church.

More recently Dr. Sockman has in his turn repudiated this endorsement.

Nevertheless, the plan has already received the endorsement of some of the foremost liberal church leaders in America and 200,000 church people have signed up to support it. This does not necessarily mean it should be approved, for the support of prominent people does not always prove a program is sacrificial or Christlike. Under the plan, church members agree to purchase certain nationally advertised products which are listed and approved by the corporation. The more such articles they buy the more income the church receives. Church members who sign now are called "broadcasters." They in turn are supposed to get other members to join. The plan will not go into effect until 250,000 church members have thus organized, but already some 200,000 have been secured. The broadcasters if they purchase the approved articles will be given credit of 2 per cent on the purchase price. They can buy these products from any store they want to. This 2 per cent would then be given to their church.

The question arises whether the Goodwin Corporation will permit all manufacturers who are willing to subscribe to the plan to join. If they do not the plan is unethical on its face. If they do permit all to join, its advertising value to the corporation would seem to be questionable. In theory the Goodwin plan sets up certain standards for all corporations whose products they approve but these are so vague that it is my belief that they would be subscribed to by every manufacturing concern in the United States. These standards are:

1. The corporation provides for the payment of a living wage.—So far as I am aware there is no concern in America which is willing to admit that it is not paying a living wage.

2. Manufacturers must provide reasonable working hours for labor. This means they must not exceed an 8-hour day and a 6-day week.—Since the Federal Government is now urging the establishment of a 30-hour week it would seem that few manufacturing concerns could not qualify at this point.

3. It provides for decent working conditions.

—Again every manufacturing concern thinks it has provided decent working conditions.

4. It must abstain from employing child labor except that children from 14 to 16 may be employed for 3 hours a day.—This standard is not one which would cause much trouble in a period when 12 million adults are unemployed.

5. The manufacturer should work towards security and permanency of employment.—This is the devout desire of every manufacturer in the United States.

In other words, the overwhelming majority of corporations in the United States now believe they are practising every single one of the standards set up by the Goodwin Corporation. Actually these ideals are merely a pious sales talk. When the writer suggested that they should establish a sixth point providing for the establishment of unions for the employees, meaning that every employee shall have the right as provided by United States law to join a union with elected officers of his own choice, the representative of the Goodwin Plan who interviewed me in New Haven retorted that this would wreck the whole plan, as it would cause the opposition of a great many people. The official reply of the corporation to this same question was so preposterous as to be humorous. Their attorney wrote: "With reference to the labor union organization, you would, I am sure, think it presumptuous of us to attempt to override the Government in that respect." As if it was overriding the government any more in endorsing labor organization according to the NRA than shorter hours of work! The minor salesman of the company in Connecticut was franker. He implied it might interfere with the amount of profits which the inside business group could secure.

It should also be noted that although the church gets 2 per cent of the sales, the agent of the corporation in Connecticut stated that those who have subscribed to stock, including district repreentatives, get 1½ per cent of the total sales plus 3 per cent to be used for advertising. In reality therefore the inside group has 4½ per cent of the total sales volume, while the church only receives 2 per cent. This is a clear index of the real motives of the insiders. Is it so much to help the church as to line their own pockets? According to the attorney for the Goodwin Corporation, it "was organized with 5,000 shares of 7% preferred stock and 5,000 shares of common stock some of which stock was sold in units of one share of preferred and two of common at a price of $100 per unit." Eventually the corporation plans to issue 3,000 shares of preferred and 6,000 shares of common. If the Goodwin Corporation was really designed to aid the church it should be organized on a non-profit basis. The returns to those who subscribe for stock should be limited to 5 per cent of the actual cash invested.

The writer recently wrote asking for the names of all subscribers to the stock of the Goodwin Corporation. In reply the attorney of the corporation refused to give this information. One business man who wrote asking to find out how stock could be secured received a reply that no stock for outsiders was available. Apparently profits for the inside few are expected to be so large that no one is willing to part with his shares. At least the President of the corporation wrote,

> Whenever it was desired to issue additional stock to that originally subscribed for, the stockholders absorbed it. I know of none of the present stockholders who are desirous of selling even a portion of their holdings. . . Of course the stockholders expect to realize on their investment in the Corporation, but to what extent is purely problematical and lies only in the future.

Here is a frank and unblushing admission of the profit nature of the whole enterprise. Should the church become a minor part in a scheme of high pressure commercial salesmanship? Should it sell its birthright of serving God and humanity for the pottage of a two per cent split on commercial sales? It is amazing that church leaders should so easily have fallen for this Goodwin Corporation plan. It is indeed an index of the extent to which religious people themselves, immersed in a capitalistic civilization and a profit culture, unconsciously fall victims to it. When the lists of products which the corporation endorses are made public, it will be found that all the products can hardly be said to have been made under Christian standards. The church would do well to keep its hands clear of the Goodwin Corporation.

JEROME DAVIS.

Yale Divinity School, New Haven.

Trumpets on New Horizons

Bewildered Years

Now we have come on the bewildered years:
Master of money, statesman, lord of toil,
Themselves entangled in the choking coil
They spread for us, grow pale beneath their fears.
Now the once honored ship of statecraft steers
Confusedly through fog; the masters' spoil
Runs low, and not renewed, nor any oil
Can calm the rising of the storm that leers.

The masters wring their hands, and mouth the same
Stale promises, and drive the same old trade
Of profits at expense of others' lives.
They try to think the old game still survives,
And we who once were diligent and tame
Reply: We trusted you, and you betrayed!

CLIFFORD GESSLER.

The Black

Through all my dreams I hear them plodding by
With tread unbroken, save by faint or stumble;
From years un-numbered comes the ceaseless rumble
Of earth that shakes and moans without a cry;
From all their throats what sound? What hate or passion?
Their song is ever of a brighter land
Whose streets are paved with gold; where hand in hand
All men shall walk with Him in brother-fashion.

But now their feet are dancing! Can it be
That all their wounds are healed, their sorrows ended?
Can heaven, dreamed of long, be truly blended
With earthly heaven, now that they are free?
Ah, no! They laugh. . . they laugh to keep from weeping!
Can Christ be dead, or are the watchmen sleeping?

MARGARET DUNNING FLICK.

Christ at a Church Supper

He came inside His church with quiet walk,
And touched with hands of light the holy spot.
One instant all His people ceased their talk—
Then shrugged, and turned away. *They knew Him not!*

ROLAND COOKE.

Nazi

Flap your demon wings
  Faster . . . faster . . .
Death is speeding . . . where
  Hate is master.

Hate is strangling you,
  You are dying.
Blood has filled your earth,
  Truth is crying.

Madness proudly rides
  On the bloody waves . . .
Truth is not asleep;
  It calls from the graves.

Flap your demon wings
  Faster . . . faster . . .
Death is speeding . . . where
  Hate is master.

FANIA KRUGER.

Cry for Peace

(A few miles north of Verdun a line of bayonets give testimony to the fate of two battalions of French Infantry buried alive.)

What were your thoughts when the avalanche rained
The solid tomb of binding dark?
Did that part of you which could not be chained
Arise to a universal spark,
In lightning-flash, alert, discover
How we can destroy but not restore?
Did dragging moments of pain uncover
The futile mockery of war?

"What were your thoughts?" with a shudder we ask,
And feel the clutch of nameless fear.
Yet we are the ones who decreed this task
Who willed that your life would finish here.
Your human heritage of duty
Still lay in the vault of years ahead.
We took your right to the glow of beauty
And gave the chill of death instead.

What were your thoughts? All your valor you set
Against that baffling depth of clay
Where only a glittering bayonet
Could find the revealing glare of day.
Our weapon carved for killing and maiming
That gave to your thwarted soul release.
For muted lips to the world exclaiming.
A wild, undying prayer for peace.

MADELINE MULVEY.

Thomas Paine

Born at Thetford, England, on January 29, 1736, of a Quaker father and an Episcopalian mother (who were ostracized by their respective communities), Thomas Paine was removed from school at the age of thirteen and taught to make stays. After a varied experience as stay-maker, excise clerk, teacher, and recognized thinker and debater, Thomas Paine met Benjamin Franklin, who gave him letters of introduction which he soon presented in America. His love of freedom and his overpowering desire to help humanity threw him into the thick of the fight for human rights.

As editor of *The Pennsylvania Magazine* he advocated and prophesied speedy separation of the Colonies from England. A number of his editorials and paragraphs were published in a pamphlet called "Common Sense," which was read by practically all literate Americans. When Independence was declared, Thomas Paine enlisted as a private, but continued his writing, some of which was read at Washington's command to revolutionary soldiers. The first words of his "Crisis," "These are times that try men's souls," have become the common possession of all men. No man did more than he to formulate and to establish the principles of the "Free and Independent States of America."

Back in England he published in 1791 the "Rights of Man," which created such a stir that his life was endangered. Going to France, again he entered the fight for freedom and became a member of the Chamber of Deputies. While he believed in the death of the office of kingship, he voted for the life of the king, for which humane and independent action he was imprisoned for nearly a year.

In 1802 Thomas Paine was brought to America on a ship provided by the President, Thomas Jefferson. The state of New York gave him a farm eighteen miles from New York City, where he spent the remainder of his days, and where he died in 1809.

Unbiased historians increasingly give Thomas Paine his proper place in history. He was a patriot of the first rank, and a father of republican ideas; he was a pioneer in the advocacy of the Constitutional form of government, the emancipation of the negro, international arbitration, the rights of women, and world patriotism; and in many other ways he proved himself a man of big ideas and large affairs.

But in the field of religion Thomas Paine is still misunderstood by the mass of people. He believed that emancipation from political tyranny could be maintained only by people emancipated from the tyranny of dogmas. He held that true religion consisted in carefully planned goodness. He regarded conscience as a growing thing and believed that the contemporary conscience had the right to sit in judgment on the standards and ideas of the past. He said, "To do good is my religion." "My own mind is my own church." Again he said, "I believe in one God, and no more; and I hope for happiness beyond this life. I believe in the equality of man; and I believe that religious duties consist in doing justice, loving mercy, and endeavoring to make our fellow creatures happy." This was substantially the belief of the leading early American statesmen and men of letters. And today it is a conservative statement from the more radical point of view of many reputable clergymen.

Thomas Paine's *cause* was to do good and to free mankind. This *cause* dominated his life. It led him to fight for his fellow laborers in England, to cast his fortune with frozen soldiers on American battlefields, to give himself freely to struggling France, to write and publish unpopular things, and through it all to face courageously sharp and bitter ingratitude. Few men, if any, ever did more for freedom in religion and life, and received less gratitude and honor for their trouble than Thomas Paine. Although enemies dogged his steps to the gate of death, he passed from the world still firm in the faith that had urged him on.

CURTIS W. REESE.

The Study Table

Two Books on Gandhi

Bishop Chitambar's book* may best be described, perhaps, as the most useful book about Mahatma Gandhi that has appeared since Romain Rolland's volume. It cannot supersede this latter work, for Roland's little biography must always be treasured for its exquisite literary quality and its profound spiritual insight. But it may admirably supplement it as a discerning interpretation of the greatest of Indians by an able and sympathetic fellow-countryman, and as carrying the dramatic story of Gandhi down into these later years.

As an outline of the Mahatma's career, the present volume is perhaps the best now available. Two admirable chapters on the Indian Nationalist Movement lead the way to a clear, accurate, and fairly full account of Gandhi's life. This account is continued, in the main body of the work, to as recent a date as August, 1933, when the Mahatma was rearrested after his sensational three weeks' fast. To this is added a "Postscript," telling of Gandhi's renewal of the fast, the coming of Mrs. Gandhi and Mr. C. F. Andrews to his bedside in Sassoon Hospital, and his release on August 23rd last. The closing page tells of his retirement from politics "for a whole year," and his dedication to *Harijan* service.

The biographical chapters are accompanied by admirable chapters in interpretation of the Indian leader's personality and influence. Especially valuable, as Dr. John R. Mott points out in his "Foreword," is the study of "the religious position of Gandhi, especially his relation to Christ and to the Christian faith." Delightful also is the picture of the lighter side of Gandhi's nature, as coupled with those exalted qualities of courage, vision and heroic sacrifice which make this man "India's noblest son." The "almost universal influence of Gandhi," says Dr. Chitambar, "can be easily explained. There are three outstanding things in Gandhi which are responsible for it. The first is the downright sacrifice that he has made to serve his country and his people. . . . The second is his irreproachable character. . . . The third is his religious nature." . . .

Bishop Chitambar is himself a Christian. In politics, he is a Liberal, a moderate who is opposed to the out-and-out demand for *Swarij* (complete self-government). He feels, on the one hand, that "India has not yet reached the stage in her national life when she can independently manage her own affairs." On the other hand, he thinks that Dominion status, as exemplified in Canada which he has visited, is wholly satisfactory for the present. "India," he writes, "has everything to gain by cooperating with the British Government and in evolving a plan whereby through the Dominion status we may attain complete political independence." The author is thus no slavish follower of the Mahatma. He retains his own integrity, and, with all due reverence, offers criticism when his mind so dictates. But this only adds value to a book which is discriminating as well as sympathetic.

Our second volume† is "a collection of articles, opinions, speeches, sermons, etc." on Gandhi. It is a part of the original material used in the writing of a manuscript, representing "many years' labor," which "was seized in transit, examined and confiscated by the local authorities as being 'of a seditious nature,' and thus lost." This sounds like Hitler's regime in Germany—and, as a matter of fact, the Nazi atrocities are in many respects familiar to the student of contemporary Indian history.

Mr. John's Anthology includes selections from forty-one separate sources. Some of the names are those of C. F. Andrews, Albert Einstein, Lloyd George, Romain Rolland, Bernard Shaw, Rabindranath Tagore; and, among Americans, Upton Close, Sherwood Eddy, Bishop Fisher, Kirby Page, "Charlie" Chaplin, and the Editor of UNITY. We sadly miss Dr. J. T. Sunderland.

The editor has been broadminded enough to include unfriendly as well as friendly comment. Thus, one may find in these pages Winston Churchill's vulgar attack upon "Mr. Gandhi, an Inner Temple lawyer, now become a seditious fakir of a type well-known in the East, striding half-naked up the steps of the Vice-Regal Palace." Also the charge of Mr. Lloyd, English magistrate of Bombay, that Gandhi "must be buried alive in prison and no one allowed access to him"! But the laudatory tributes overwhelmingly prevail, culminating in Tagore's declaration that Gandhi "is not only the greatest man in India, he is the greatest man on earth today."

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES.

*"Mahatma Gandhi: His Life, Work and Influence," by Jashwant R. Chitambar. Published by John C. Winston Company, Philadelphia. $2.00.

†"Gandhi As Others See Him," compiled by Joseph John. Foreword by E. V. Ratnam. Published by W. E. Bastian & Co., Colombo.

The Church and the Social Question

One feels on reading this able book** that the author has "earned the right" to handle the subject of which it treats. His work at the Labor Temple in New York for nearly fifteen years has been so eminently successful, his wide and intimate contact with working people so sympathetic and understanding, his study of the industrial problem so thorough that he is competent to treat with a high degree of authority both the problem and the opportunity of the churches, as well as to tread with confidence the intricate and difficult paths of the economic field. Dr. Chaffee believes that the churches can wield a decisive influence in the crises that are upon us in turning our destinies into ways that are good, away from the violence of revolution, but also away from the gross inequities of the capitalistic system. There is no question that the churches might be a very considerable makeweight toward these highly desirable ends, but to suppose that they will take a first hand place in the revolutionary changes that are coming seems to your reviewer to lose sight of certain obstinate facts.

Dr. Chaffee emphasizes two foci in the ellipse of his argument, Jesus and Karl Marx. He plays the two over against each other, hoping that a balance may be struck in which the ethical teachings of Jesus will mitigate the rigors of Marx's class struggle. To this end he urges upon the leadership and the membership of the Protestant churches a thorough familiarity with the Marxian doctrines, as also of the whole industrial set up of our own time, and then a vigorous advance in order that a "Christian" solution of our troubles may be found.

His attitude toward Jesus makes tacit confession of the difficulties which confront anyone who tries to argue for reforms from the teachings of Jesus. He

**"The Protestant Churches and the Industrial Crisis," by Edmund B. Chaffee. Published by Macmillan. $2.50.

must convert to a belief in the authenticity and wisdom of those teachings those who are not wholly convinced, and then bring this argument behind his own. The topic which our author has set before his readers tacitly assumes that the churches are "Christian" in the sense that they have some passion for bringing the teachings of Jesus into the solution of industrial problems. His supporting argument, however, more or less openly assumes that the churches themselves must be brought to believe in Jesus as an ethical authority.

Dr. Chaffee makes no reference to the literature which deals with the topic treated in such books as Tawney's "Religion and the Rise of Capitalism." The Protestant religion, so this argument runs, is, if not the originator of capitalism, at least its active side partner. It may be said of this argument that the most influential element in the Protestant churches has no such attitude toward wealth as Jesus appears to have had. In the minds of the church's adherents Jesus is more of a theological figure than an ethical prophet. So that one feels a sense of futility in this whole argument from the teaching and authority of Jesus. While you are converting the ministers and the churches to any real belief in Jesus as a prophet, the crisis will have come and been handled either by the Marxists or the Fascists. Indeed, if organized religion runs true to form it is more likely to be found on the side of Fascism than of Marxism. The ethical makeweight must come from life movements themselves, bolstered up if you will by the teachings of Jesus, but mostly with its own inherent authority springing from the issues of life itself. Unless the 20th century has its own humanitarian urge issuing forth from the living present, and so has its own compelling authority, it will be delivered over into the hands of the enemy, while those who look with longing over their shoulders to a time "when Jesus was here among men" will find themselves in the company of Lot's wife. For it is out of Jesus' own mouth that the words came, "And why, even of yourselves, judge ye not what is right?"

The Marxian class struggle is on. It may be devoutly hoped that its rigors can be mitigated by the churches under the spell and the charm and the authority of the teachings of Jesus. Among those teachings, however, it should be borne in mind, there are highly inflammatory words. It was he who related the parable of the vineyard which had been let out by the owner to husbandmen. It was he who said, "He (meaning the owner) will miserably destroy those wicked men, and will let out his vineyard to other husbandmen, who shall render him the fruits in their seasons." And if objection is made to this parable as having any bearing on present day problems, the objection shows the futility of attempting to pin the teachings of Jesus down to cases.

The same difficulty inheres in the attempt to make the word "Christian" carry the full content which the spirit of this book so finely exemplifies. In New York where the Labor Temple is doing its beneficent work there are close to 2,000,000 Jews. No one who knows, and who does not! the magnificent contribution they have made and are making to the philanthropic and civic life of New York and elsewhere can find it possible to differentiate between the spirit which they exemplify and that which Dr. Chaffee has in mind when he uses the word Christian. A word which will fitly characterize this spirit and not carry with it any sectarian implication is greatly needed.

May I close by heartily commending this noteworthy book to all readers of UNITY.

JAMES A. FAIRLEY.

Correspondence

Religion and Science

Editor of UNITY:

Religion is truth expressed in symbolism—the poetry of life. It is an attempt on the part of mankind to harmonize themselves in a mystic union with the invisible driving forces of the cosmos; to adjust their needs and hopes to the plan and will of some power which they deem to be greater and nobler than themselves; to attain permanence and happiness amidst the flux and miseries of evolution; and to reach into the realm of the ideal and lay hold of those eternal verities which they suppose to be purposely and essentially involved in human destiny.

The appeal of religion is to man's emotional nature —to the sentiments and feelings, the proper development of which is necessary to the good life.

Science is the interrogation of nature—the classified and coordinated knowledge of the human race. It is also an attitude of mind based upon the experimental and inductive methods—a way of thinking that rules out the supernatural or miraculous.

The appeal of science is to the intellect—the thinking processes—and is of real value only insofar as it aids humanity to achieve its ideals. Without idealism, without the vision of world-wide human happiness, science and technology (applied science) are destructive forces. For happiness, as a wise man has said, is the only good, and the place to be happy is here.

Religion is the traditional way of looking at life and the universe; science is the modern way. Therefore, a proper adjustment between science and religion is highly desirable. But this adjustment will not be accomplished unless and until a drastic reorientation of both knowledge and faith is brought about.

So long as religionists continue the hair-splitting sectarian wrangles of medievalism; so long as they stir the witch's cauldron of racial, religious and nationalistic passions; so long as they maintain that Genesis is a suitable text-book of science and ethics for the twentieth century; so long as they sleep in the tents of their fathers and insist upon supernaturalism as the first requisite of religion—just that long will the younger generation advance without them, marching by the tent of the tabernacle in the vanguard of science.

On the other hand we find science persisting in its attitude of disdainful aloofness toward the problems of the heart—toward idealism and ethics. We see the perversion of science in the modern system of warfare. We see the scientist weld the world into a neighborhood with instruments of rapid transportation and communication; and at the same time we see him arming the neighbors with poisonous gases and machines of murder, lending himself as a wage slave to the international racketeers—to the financial imperialists and builders of armaments.

A leading Japanese Christian recently asserted

that "religionists should assume responsibility for the frequent occurrence of war; should recognize that the moral law governs international as well as personal relations." But it is equally true that the scientists should assume responsibility for the inhuman destructiveness of modern war; that they are primarily responsible for situations wherein women, babes and other noncombatants are placed at the mercy of bombing planes raining down death and destruction from above the clouds, usually in the dead of night.

Both the religionist and the scientist must learn that human welfare is not dependent upon creed and abundance of knowledge, but upon tolerance, ethics and the right application of knowledge. The world progresses not through leadership and special privilege, but through equal opportunity and cooperation; and this applies to races, religions and nations, as well as individuals.

R. J. WESTLAKE.

South Charleston, Ohio.

The Field

(*Continued from page* 190)

And then the Babylonic chaos of simultaneous translation! Noise, heat and enthusiasm. . . . Or the worse confusion in which we arrived on a gray morning (we were the advance guard, and had come a day early, for the honor of old England, lest it should be said that even her anti-patriots were of the same superb conceit as the Empire Britannique, arriving a day late in contempt of the foreigner).

On that Friday morning we found our way to the temporary bureau of the Conference. It turned out to be in a sort of decayed courtyard, where the broken windows of deserted rooms looked out upon a scene of poverty and desolation. An ironical placard with the words: "Robes et Manteaux" set off the whole picture neatly, giving its dilapidation an air of melancholy humor. We wait what seems an intolerable age. A heap of straw suggests comfort to one, who falls promptly to sleep. Then others arrive—French, Germans and Swiss; a Spaniard. We explore our skill in foreign languages, but no one can make the Spaniard understand anything, although the poor fellow clearly and volubly demands information. All the living languages known to us having failed, an enterprising comrade racks his wits for the only remaining resort . . . *"Ava Maria, gratia plena, dominus te cum, benedictu in nulieribus . . ."* From an Iberian explosion the single word "Communist" emerges. So *his* reflexes work pretty well, anyway.

And then the young enthusiast who arrives—a man born to lead, who will find his way anywhere in the world, by the simple expedient of asking the first person he meets and making a life-long friend in five minutes. In his company the unbelievable happens. We forget that we are sleepless, filthy and unshaved. We resign ourselves cheerfully to the distant prospect of a hypothetical hotel sometime before midnight. We begin our travels again, by way of the intolerable Parisian underground, with its maze of junctions, to search for the Wall of the Communards.

This wall stands at the far end of a Catholic Cemetery. Here or hereabouts fell the last defenders of the Paris Commune. The Wall is hung with wreaths from the four corners of the earth. The Commune is dead; long live the Commune!

At last the Conference Hall. Barbusse opens the ball. His perfect and polished phrases are given to us in an English translation by Reginald Bridgeman, whose twenty years in the Foreign Office and Diplomatic Service make him one of the most useful, as well as the most intriguing of the "personalities" in the anti-war movement. A glance at Barbusse and Bridgeman followed by a rapid survey of such a Conference as this convinces one of Caesar's wisdom: Here are no "sleek-headed men and such as sleep o' nights."

The report of the initiating committee—of preposterous length and delivered with all the delays known to rhetoric—takes up the rest of the session. We find our hotel, sleeping "à trois" or "à quatre" in bedrooms intended for two, but tired enough to sleep on a spiked railing. Saturday brings the rest of the British delegation. The Conference is now in full swing—plenary sessions, national delegation meetings, committees, commissions. The French are, *naturellement,* the largest delegation. We come second—apparently quite a record, with 82 delegates—and then the Germans. These German boys and girls have come with false passports or no passports at all or boldly passed the frontier on heaven knows what ostensible business. All "mandates" are closely scrutinized. There is a careful watch kept on each of the three gangways through which one passes (consecutively) on the way to the conference hall, so that one's credentials may be examined. No photographs may be taken in the hall.

Once at least there is a big "thrill." Two French soldiers, their badges carefully covered over, are brought in. They have come to declare their solidarity with the workers, which they do in emphatic speeches. A German worker mounts the platform and embraces one of the French soldiers, dramatizing the situation. Good work, that.

* * *

We departed (all except the students and a few others in the British delegation, who stayed over for an excursion and a students' conference) on Sunday night, while the final plenary session was still in progress. A final burst of the *Bandiera Rossa* and other revolutionary songs, a stampede for St. Lazare, and (for us) the Conference was over.

Whatever its value, I suppose it had achieved its inspirational function so far as our delegation was concerned. We left, however, without a single decision having been made by the Conference as a whole, and without leaving behind us any definite instructions or resolutions to be urged in the Presidium by our remaining representatives. Behind this fact lay a tangled mixture of stupidity and intrigue which was responsible for a complete wasting of the time of the British delegation in irrelevant discussions. It seems a pity to end my sketch of the Conference with a reference to this, but it is my own final impression and it contains (I believe) a criticism which will have to be recognized and acted upon if future conferences are to be saved from the worst faults of Amsterdam and Paris.

Two examples will be sufficient to illustrate the worst tendency in the Conference. In the first place, there was a speech of intolerable length by the head of the Soviet delegation, which took up a large portion of the Saturday morning, and consisted largely of petty detail information on the domestic affairs of the Soviet Union. There was little if anything in this speech that could

not be found in the current publications of King Street, and hardly a point in the whole address that bore directly upon the problem of war resistance in capitalist countries. And yet, because this speech happened to be by a Soviet delegate on the subject of the Soviet, it had not only to be translated and circularized to every delegation in a 27-page cyclostyped foolscap document, but in *addition* to this (lest the Conference should break down by having to wait 24 hours for information regarding the Five Year Plan) a translation was given orally which took up a solid hour of the priceless time in which we met as a national delegation.

The other criticism that comes to my mind concerns the sudden introduction among the British delegates of a young German (a member of the Presidium) who began to put before us some confused story about some French "obstructionists" who were trying to wreck the Conference. So far as I could understand who or what these "obstructionists" were supposed to be, I think I should have opposed them vigorously myself, *granted that the charges were true.* But to a direct challenge made from the floor that the alleged "obstructionists" should be allowed to answer these vague and incoherent charges made against them we got nothing but a further abusive denunciation of the supposed malefactors by members of our own committee! As in the case of the Soviet speech, a majority of the delegates seemed prepared to support the committee in its standpoint, however irrational. This one-sided procedure was therefore approved in spite of protest.

Such maneuvers as these, whether by design or accident, occupied the time of the British delegation so effectively that all decisions on policy were protracted until it was too late to submit any proposals that could be considered by the Conference or the Presidium. As at Amsterdam, promises were made that opportunities would be afforded, etc., etc. On one point (the amendment of the Report) on which I was myself active, a committee was actually appointed to draft proposals which were never so much as considered by the delegation owing to the waste of time and procrastination in calling the final delegation meeting. This was typical of the whole Conference: it was impossible not to feel that the arrangement of discussions was "wangled" quite unscrupulously in the interest of a clique.*

I do not wish, however, to finish with this impression. There was much more at the Conference, after all, than stupidity and intrigue. There was a splendid defiance, expressed in such gestures as the appointment of Torgler and the three Bulgarian prisoners in the Reichstag Fire Trial to the "Presidium of Honour." There was the wreath on that empty chair on the platform where Bruno Tesch, executed by the Nazis at Altona, should have had his place. There was the bright suggestion — emanating from the British delegation—that the Nobel Peace Prize, hitherto the reward of charlatans and quacks, should be given to Comrade Litvinoff for his solid work in the cause of world peace!

"Youth against War." We may bungle it again, and I suppose it's as well to know it. But it is the best slogan for our generation; and Paris (like Amsterdam) may yet confound its critics, including your British correspondent,

REGINALD A. REYNOLDS.

*The method of appointing speakers from the delegation illustrated only too well the prevailing attitude. First the number was decided on—i. e. that we should ask for one more speaker than the Presidium had allowed us, and more than our numbers warranted. Next the allocation of speakers to Sectional interests. And lastly (in theory at least, though in practice this was mostly cut out) a discussion of the points we wished our speakers to raise in the Conference. It would be difficult to imagine a procedure less democratic.

NIGHT SHALL PASS

By Henry E. Swensen

Vital Poems of Social Vision

Foreword by Lucia Trent and Ralph Cheyney

"An enduring contribution," by Etta Josephine Murfey in UNITY.
"His poems reveal vision and power."—Thos. C. Clark of *Christian Century.*

An Attractive Gift, 60 cents

Poetry Publishers, 529 Callowhill St., Philadelphia, Pa.

?

What is the OXFORD GROUP

by
the Layman with a Notebook

"You cannot belong to the Oxford Group. It has no membership list, subscriptions, badges, rules, or definite locations. It is a name for a group of people who, from every rank, profession, and trade, in many countries, have surrendered their lives to God and who are endeavoring to lead a spiritual quality of life under the guidance of the Holy Spirit."

Such, in essence, is the Oxford Group, says the author. This little book tells you what it is, and presents its aims and its spiritual message directly out of a deep personal experience.

This book shows how the Oxford Group offers Fellowship in Christ to the world; reborn souls to the Churches; a sane, practical Christianity to put right the spiritual and material problems which confront us. Whatever your creed, whatever your beliefs, writes the "Layman with a Notebook," there is a regenerating power in the Oxford Group. He tells how thousands of people all over the world offer evidence of what the life changing of the Oxford Group has done for them and can do for all.

This book is in a way a Primer of the Oxford Group. The first edition of 10,000 copies was sold out on publication in England. The American edition is now ready. You can obtain a copy at any bookstore or from the Publishers. Price $1.25.

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS
114 FIFTH AVENUE NEW YORK